



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

WILMINGTON, DE

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 921,263	08 02 2001	Frederic Garcon	PM00053	8691

23416 7590 11 07 2002

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP  
1220 N MARKET STREET  
P O BOX 2207  
WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

KALLIS, RUSSELL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1638

DATE MAILED: 11 07 2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/921,263

Applicant(s)

GARCON ET AL.

Examiner

Russell Kallis

Art Unit

1638

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  
7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Color photographs and color drawings are acceptable only for examination purposes unless a petition filed under 37 CFR 1.84(a)(2) is granted permitting their use as acceptable drawings. In the event that applicant wishes to use the drawings currently on file as acceptable drawings, a petition must be filed for acceptance of the color photographs or color drawings as acceptable drawings. Any such petition must be accompanied by the appropriate fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h), three sets of color drawings or color photographs, as appropriate, and an amendment to the first paragraph of the brief description of the drawings section of the specification which states:

The patent or application file contains at least one drawing executed in color. Copies of this patent or patent application publication with color drawing(s) will be provided by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office upon request and payment of the necessary fee.

Color photographs will be accepted if the conditions for accepting color drawings have been satisfied.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

*Arrangement of the Specification*

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or  
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Specifically, the application is missing headings for parts (e), (f) and (h), and is missing part (g).

2. Claims 6-11 and 13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). In the interest of compact prosecution, the claims have been treated on the merits. Such treatment does not relieve Applicant of the requirement to respond to this objection.

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference. The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973). See page 8 lines 5, 9, 10, 13, 18, and 20 and page 9 lines 19, 28, 29, and 30 of the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant claims genes for tolerance to HPPD inhibitors.

Applicant does not describe all genes for tolerance to HPPD inhibitors other than the mutated DNA from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* comprising sequences 3045-4119 and 1795-2869 of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2 respectively (see pages 8 and 9 of the specification bottom and top of the page respectively).

Therefore, it is not clear that Applicant was in possession of the invention as broadly claimed.

See *University of California V. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997), which teaches that the disclosure of a process for obtaining cDNA from a particular organism and the description of the encoded protein fail to provide an adequate written description of the actual cDNA from that organism which would encode the protein from that organism, despite the disclosure of a cDNA encoding that protein from another organism.

The court also addressed the manner by which genus of cDNAs might be described: "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus." *Id.* At 1406.

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant broadly claims a method for transforming cultured and competent plant cells including dicoteledenous plant cells by pretreatment with an HPPD inhibitor, transformation with a gene for tolerance to HPPD inhibitors, selection for resistant plant tissue to said inhibitor, and regeneration of bombarded and selected tissue to yield fertile transformed plants that yield seeds.

Applicant teaches somatic embryogenesis of soybean embryos producing transformationally competent tissue (Example 1 page 13, lines 1-27), transformation via particle bombardment using tungsten particles (Example 1 page 13 line 28 to page 14 line 13), regeneration of bombarded tissues (Example 1 page 14, lines 15-33), bombardment of soybean embryogenic callus using a gene conferring tolerance to HPPD inhibitors, i.e. selected and regenerated on D20 medium and a greater number of calluses generated when initiating the selection process before the bombardment (Example 2 page 15 lines 5-30), bombardment of soybean embryogenic callus using a gene conferring tolerance to HPPD inhibitors selected and regenerated on FNL medium (Example 3 page 16 lines 3-29).

Applicant does not teach the presence of either of the mutated HPPD transgenes from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (W336 or W33) conferring tolerance to HPPD inhibitors in any of the bombarded tissue, the regeneration of a soybean plant comprising either of the mutated HPPD transgenes from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (W336 or W33) conferring tolerance to HPPD inhibitors, and transformed seeds comprising either of the mutated HPPD transgenes from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (W336 or W33) conferring tolerance to HPPD inhibitors.

The unpredictability that can arise in applying selection for a transgene before transformation with the gene carrying resistance to the selectable marker is made evident in analogous examples where selection for resistance to herbicides was performed on untransformed cells in the presence of an amount of herbicide that would not kill the plant tissue over the time of the exposure (Chaleff R., U.S. Patent 4,443,971 see entire Abstract).

Unpredictability is also apparent since rare and resistant cells showing a resistant phenotype at the cellular level may not afford any regeneration into a whole plant because the resistant cells may acquire other mutations at alleles that would interfere with the plant cells morphogenic properties. (Chaleff R. *et al.* UCLA Symposium, Steamboat Springs, March 30-April 6 1986; page 421, Mutation Breeding, lines 16-24).

Given the lack of guidance, the limited working examples in the specification, the breadth of the claims, and the unpredictability in the art, undue trial and error experimentation would have been required by one skilled in the art to identify and isolate a multitude of non-exemplified genes for resistance to HPPD inhibitors, for transformation of non-exemplified monocotyledenous or dicotyledenous plant cells, regenerated into non-exemplified amorphous monocotyledenous or dicotyledenous calli and monocotyledenous or dicotyledenous plants transformed with said genes resistant to HPPD inhibitors. Thus, the claims are not enabled.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Dependent claims are included in all rejections.

At Claim 2, "characterized in that it consists in carrying out" is awkward. Replace with -- and further comprising--.

At Claim 4, line 2, "in particular" fails to positively recite a required claim element.

At Claim 10, lines 4 and 6, "in particular" fails to positively recite a required claim element.

At Claim 11, line 9, "more preferably" fails to positively recite a required claim element.

At Claim 11, line 10, "[lacuna]" is indefinite, it is not clear what is numerical value is intended.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 4, 10 and 11 recite broad ranges followed by "in particular" or "more preferably", followed by narrow ranges.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the seeds" in line 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Delete "the" before "seeds".

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The first generation transgenic plants, because they are

hemizygous for the transgene, would generate gametes not carrying the transgenic material. Thus, the seeds of the claimed invention would comprise non-transformed material and thereby read upon a product of nature. The claims should be amended to recite --seeds comprising the transgene--. See *American Wood v. Fiber Distintegrating Co.*, 90 U.S. 566 (1974), *American Fruit Growers v. Brogdex Co.*, 283 U.S. 2 (1931), *Funk Brothers Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.*, 33 U.S. 127 (1948), *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 206 USPQ 193 (1980).

10. Claims 1-13 are deemed free of the prior art, given the failure of the prior art to teach or reasonably suggest a method for plant transformation using genes for tolerance to HPPD inhibitors and incubation on the selectable marker prior to transformation.

11. All claims are rejected.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Kallis whose telephone number is (703) 305-5417. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amy Nelson can be reached on (703) 306-3218. The fax phone numbers for the Group is (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding, or if the examiner cannot be reached as indicated above, should be directed to the legal analyst, Sonya Williams, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0009.

Russell Kallis Ph.D.  
November 4, 2002

DAVID T. FOX  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 16 38

*Deeind 14*